

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9683

as the food shortages, have threatened more than once to take matters into their own hands. I heard some claims in New Delhi that the trouble with a plebiscite in Kashmir was that it could lead to demands for plebiscites in such restless constituent States as the Punjab and Madras. But no responsible Government official could bring himself to any such declaration of the fragility of Indian union.

It is true that a nation of such diverse ingredients and such ancient forces of sectionalism and sectarianism as India cannot take its unity for granted. But the officer in the Ministry of External Affairs responsible for Kashmir, B. L. Sharma, a knowledgeable and perceptive man, believes that India has twice had its ordeal by fire and its capacity to stay united. The first occasion, the invasion by China of Indian territory and the remarkably swift and concerted rallying of the population, clearly established India's essential unity. The other was the death of Nehru, and the nation's ability promptly to agree on a new leader after Nehru, stating flatly that it was the duty of a democratic people to choose its own leadership, had refused to name a political heir—again demonstrated its singleness of purpose.

I sat with Sharma in his quiet chambers in the Secretariat at New Delhi as, late in afternoon when everyone else had gone, he speculated about the effect of Kashmir on Indian unity—whether the move to absorb Kashmir did not again reflect a national unity of will. But he knew that this was not so, and he turned quickly to the emerging figure of Shastri, and to his differences from Nehru, rather than any similarities, as a more likely unifying factor.

Far from being in any way either a symbol or a source of unity in India, the Kashmir impasse is keeping alive the Moslem-Hindu hostility that split the nation apart at the time of independence and still arrays its 425 million Hindus against its 50 million Moslems. It has, moreover, been in large measure the reason why both Pakistan and India have devoted such a large proportion of their resources—badly needed for the hungry and undernourished—to the military. (In 1 year India devoted 50 percent of her budget to military purposes; in another Pakistan devoted 80 percent to them.) It has interrupted such urgent joint Indo-Pakistani undertakings as the Indus River development project. It has paralyzed for 16 years the praiseworthy work of a conscientious commission of the United Nations and diminished the influence of that body among emerging nations with whom it ought to be strengthened. It is alienating a valued friend of the West, as Pakistan fearful—justifiably or not—that American weapons in India may be turned on them as India steps up the use of force in Kashmir, forges new bonds with Red China. And in both Pakistan and India, is is building up attitudes of hate and suspicion and inspiring a dialogue of vituperation, counsels of extremism, and an explosive atmosphere of anxiety.

As I left the President's house in Muzaffarabad, however, I was sharply reminded of the bitterest price of all—the plight of the 4 million Kashmiri, wholly deprived of any voice in their own fate, as bleak pawns in a purposeless stalemate. The sound of the gunfire was still echoing, as it had all through the afternoon and evening, from the cease-fire line. That weekend 12 people were killed, 7 of them Kashmiri villagers. Since the cease-fire line was established, an estimated 16,000 have died, half of them civilians. The living hostages had little to expect of the future—too little food, too little education, too little clothing and housing, too little dignity, and too little sense of their own identity. President Hamid, the justice turned administrator, saw the question in

my mind before I could phrase it. "The whole answer, the only answer," he said, "is in the first article of the U.N. Charter, where the purpose of the United Nations is clearly stated: 'To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.'" His voice trailed off, and he looked at the mountains surrounding us, I thought that his look seemed directed more hopefully to the future than regrettably to the past.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DECISION TO SEND U.S. TROOPS TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as I stated last Saturday, in a speech to the Oklahoma Junior Chamber of Commerce State convention, meeting in Tulsa, Okla., I endorse the decisive action of President Johnson in sending troops to the Dominican Republic.

His prompt decision was necessary—there being no OAS peacekeeping force then in being—in order to protect the lives of American nationals and to prevent the establishment of another Communist government in this hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two editorials which also approve the action taken by President Johnson.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 5, 1965]

INSTEAD OF DOING NOTHING

Debate over the Dominican crisis in the United Nations Security Council and the Organization of American States during the past 2 days puts into clear focus the difficult problem and the grave decision that confronted President Johnson a week ago. That was when he received desperate and urgent appeals for help from Santo Domingo—where thousands of Americans and others were in imminent danger of mass slaughter by bands of terrorists roaming the lawless city.

Events of the past 48 hours strengthen the argument of the President that it might have been impossible to get international sanction for a rescue mission to the Dominican Republic in time to do any good. Men and women could have been slaughtered in the streets by the hundreds while the OAS or the U.N. were deciding what, if anything, to do about it.

This does not mean the OAS should have been bypassed. We believe, and have said repeatedly since the outset of the Dominican crisis, that the Organization of American States has both the authority and the duty to take effective action in emergencies of this type. There is a great need—underscored by the present situation—for a general overhaul of the OAS administrative and executive machinery so it can be counted on to act both decisively and swiftly when catastrophe is imminent.

As President Johnson put it, "We don't propose to sit here in our rocking chair with our hands folded and let the Communists set up a government anywhere in the Western Hemisphere."

And, as Ambassador Stevenson noted, in addressing the Security Council, "Deliberate effort of Havana and Moscow to promote subversion and overthrow governments, in flagrant violation of international conduct, is responsible for much of the unrest in the Caribbean area."

It is extremely unfortunate—but an un-

deniable fact—that some of the most vocal criticism of President Johnson, in the U.N. and in the OAS, has come from countries which oppose constructive action or initiative by international organizations. Those who frustrate any kind of response to crisis at the international level, while at the same time opposing any recourse to unilateral action, seem to be advocating that nothing be done by anybody, in any circumstances, to help people in danger or to repel Communist subversion.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, May 3, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON THE DOMINICAN REVOLT

Emotionally and with deep sincerity President Johnson brought into perspective the dangers of the Dominican revolution to the American people Sunday night. His appearance on television was without any advance notice, and came as a complete surprise. With his message he announced orders for 4,500 more American troops to go to the island. Here is an instance in which many citizens of the United States are satisfied with his decision, satisfied with his reasoning, and applaud him for the speed and magnitude of his moves. He does not have to justify his actions Sunday or during the previous week to the American citizen.

The value of his speech domestically may well be the revelation that the American citizen and he are both in agreement and that they have been thinking along the same lines ever since his first step Wednesday ordering the Marines to Santo Domingo. There will be no national argument over his decision. A total of 15,000 troops into an island in 5 days is an example of going all out. The act of Wednesday, coupled with the orders of Friday and Sunday, are proof to most of us that the Dominican campaign is not too little and too late. Probably it was unnecessary for the President to go before the people, but the fact that he did means that in spite of the rigors of the office, he intends to show a rapport with Americans.

With equal emphasis his speech was directed toward the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. He made references to the number of American and foreign nationals in the Dominican Republic who had to be and have been protected by American forces. He recounted the steps taken by the United States to bring the Organization of American States into a responsible role toward the solution of the Dominican crisis. He explained that it was impossible to discuss or debate whether troops should be sent. That is why the OAS was not asked to consider the desirability of the American military intervention. The handling of the problem before the OAS has been and will continue to be careful and hopefully constructive. The point has been well made by the President and his advisers that the sole interest of the United States in the Dominican Republic is that it have a chance to vote freely in the establishment of a democratic government. If he made this point once in his speech, he made it several times.

To many the most important part of the President's remarks was his declaration of an enlarged policy with respect to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. He said, "The American nations cannot, must not, and will not, permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere." While revolution may be a matter for each individual country to deal with, "it becomes a matter calling for hemispheric action only when the object is the establishment of a Communist dictatorship."

The President had previously commented on the Communist infiltration by Cuban-

May 10, 1965

trained Reds of the Dominican revolt. He explained how they had taken over the revolt and were trying to transform it into Castroism. He made it clear that this added to the alarm of the U.S. Government.

It may be necessary this week that more troops be sent. He did not give this indication, but he has clearly affixed the policy: namely, no Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. He has made this promise, and the evidence is clear he intends to keep it.

SUMMARY OF MEDICARE TESTIMONY, MAY 10

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, in testimony received by the Finance Committee this morning, six more witnesses appeared on H.R. 6675. I ask unanimous consent that an unofficial summary, prepared by my staff, may appear in the RECORD, following those I have offered on previous days of the hearings.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS, MONDAY MAY 10, 1965

AMERICAN LIFE CONVENTION, HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, LIFE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, LIFE INSURERS CONFERENCE

Manton Eddy, senior vice president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Bloomfield, Conn. Five hundred insurance company members of the four associations represented write 90 percent of health insurance issued by U.S. insurance companies.

1. Basic coverage (part A) "unnecessary in the light of the existing magnitude and growth of voluntary health insurance, coupled with governmental programs for those who need help." Remainder of points relate to part B, the supplementary voluntary plan.

2. Selection from different kinds of plans should be available instead of an inflexible single supplementary plan.

3. The supplementary plan preempts the field, involves Government "direct competition with private insurance" which would be "unfair." In sum, "part B calls for much more study and hence should be deleted from the present bill."

4. "We oppose the projected 1971 increase (in taxable wage base, sec. 320) to \$6,600." Wage base should not exceed "current average earnings of full-time workers covered."

5. Disability provisions (sec. 303) should be deleted.

6. Full tax deduction (rather than one-half up to \$250) should be allowed on medical insurance expenses.

7. Section 213(e)(2) should allow statement of medical costs in a multipurpose policy by the insurance company, not simply require cost specification in contracts.

8. Deduction should be allowed for costs of income indemnity insurance.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS

Ralph R. Cooke, Richmond, Va., pharmacist, past president. The National Association of Retail Druggists represents 41,000 of the Nation's 54,000 drugstores, speaks for "practicing retail pharmacists."

1. Proposes amendment of section 1861(t) to allow prescription by brand names as well as generic names (formulary dispensing).

2. Opposes allowing coverage regardless of need; for "a screening process of some kind."

3. The 3-day prior hospitalization for eligibility to extended care facilities should be deleted.

4. Hospital out-patient facilities may involve excessive travel. There should be "maximum use of existing treatment institutions," doctors' facilities, etc., instead of solely hospital-connected treatment.

R. B. ROBINS, M.D.

(Past president, American Academy of General Practice, and of Arkansas Medical Society. Member, Democratic National Committee, 1944-52.)

1. "In vigorous opposition to a program of health care under centralized Federal administration" financed by wage earners "for millions of Americans who do not need the assistance."

2. Young doctors will be discouraged from entering medicine.

3. Doctor-patient relationships will be disrupted.

4. Doctors should not be forced into the social security system.

GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE OF NEW YORK

Arthur H. Harlow, Jr., president. Insures 800,000 people, processing 40,000 claims weekly as a "consumer oriented plan."

1. "GHI favors the bill before your committee."

2. Favors inclusion of anesthesiologists, radiologists, etc., in basic hospital costs.

3. Regrets limitations of coinsurance, "substantial deductible," exclusion of preventative medicine.

4. Primary point: Choice of plans should be available. "Independent plans" should be available (in the supplementary section) with "the beneficial results of private competition."

CREATER PHILADELPHIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

(George L. Clothier, personnel superintendent Strawbridge & Clothier (department store), chairman of the chamber's hospital task force.)

1. "In general sympathy with most of the objectives," including Kerr-Mills extension, basic hospital plan controls, separate voluntary supplemental plan.

2. Effective date of both basic and supplementary plans should be July 1, 1967.

3. Cost control should be improved with uniform cost accounting systems for hospitals, while allowing for major differences.

4. Financial incentives (reimbursement principles) should encourage hospitals to hold down costs and to transfer patients to other facilities.

5. There should be uniform terminology and numerical coding for all medical and surgical services and procedures.

6. There should be review and appeal procedures in each State on above and all other regulations adopted.

7. Benefits should be "graduated according to ability to pay" and consideration given to other available funds. The supplementary plan should have maximum dollar limits.

8. Urge "extreme caution" lest this be "the camel's nose in the tent."

CHICAGO MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

(Dr. Paul E. Hanchett, educational director.)

The bill "should be unhesitatingly passed." Like education, health care requires payment collectively. Medical care is "a precondition to the efficient production and enjoyment of all other commodities," with implications beyond direct health benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1164) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1164) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on behalf of himself and other Senators, No. 162, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, No. 124, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the time status so far as the pending amendment is concerned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have used 187 minutes and the opponents have used 165 minutes.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to clear the decks, I hope that the proponents and the opponents of the pending amendment will divide the time as equally as possible. With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work tonight, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no morning hour tomorrow. Immediately after the prayer the Senate will resume consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], on behalf of himself and other Senators, numbered 162, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, numbered 124, offered by myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, immediately after the prayer, the available time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time necessary therefor being charged to me. It will be a brief call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 hour to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the pending amendment

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9721

AIKEN, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, MILWARD SIMPSON, LEN B. JORDAN, and JAMES B. PEARSON.

IS THE OAS WRITING HISTORY ON THIS CONTINENT? THE STORY OF HOW PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MOVE IN THE CARIBBEAN IS BEING VINDICATED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield whatever time is necessary to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

The Organization of American States is now meeting at the Pan American Union to decide what action to take with relation to events in the Dominican Republic. The outcome of that meeting will be of historical dimensions. What the 20 special delegates from the American Republics decide to do about the Dominican situation will determine whether OAS machinery for peace and security in the Western Hemisphere moves forward into the context of the 1960's or grinds to a disastrous halt.

On May 6 I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the situation in the Dominican Republic is totally different from the one we face in Vietnam. For one thing it is at our front door in the Caribbean. It is not on the continent of Asia. I commend the President for his swift action in the Dominican Republic, both for humanitarian purposes—the saving of lives—and for heading off Communist takeover in the Caribbean. I also urged that our initial action be made as soon as possible a joint concern of all the American Republics. I am glad that the administration did indeed lay the matter before the Organization of American States.

Unhappily, the U.S. press has been gravely derelict in reporting what has transpired in the OAS with regard to the Dominican crisis. Reports continue to imply that the United States overacted in the Dominican circumstances. While generally accepting the necessity to rescue U.S. national and other foreigners whose lives were endangered, commentators express doubts regarding the wisdom of expanding our mission to prevent a Communist takeover. Many reports question the extent of Communist infiltration.

Yet, to my knowledge, none of the major wire services, newspapers, or radio-television systems have taken the trouble to examine the findings of the OAS investigating team that returned from the Dominican Republic last weekend. The Special Committee of the OAS consisted of the following five Latin American Ambassadors: Ricardo M. Colombo, Argentina; Elmar Penna Marinho, Brazil; Alfredo Vazquez Carrizosa, Colombia; Carlos Garcia Bauer, Gutemala, and Frank Morrice, Panama.

On Friday night, May 7, the Council of the OAS met to question the Committee regarding its findings in the Dominican Republic. The meeting lasted almost until 3 o'clock Saturday morning. While the meeting was private and the press not admitted, the OAS Council de-

cided to release its proceedings so that the hemisphere—indeed the world—could be apprised of the true situation in the Dominican Republic.

The Pan American Union made the document available to the press on Saturday night about 8 p.m. The text is in Spanish, so it appears that reporters who do not read Spanish simply ignored its existence. I understand that the OAS secretariat does not provide translations of proceedings in languages other than those in which they transpire. Since the text of this particular meeting is so important, I shall put the entire document into the RECORD as soon as I have it translated.

Meanwhile, it is imperative that the gist of the Ambassadors' revelations be widely publicized. If we are to judge the efficacy of U.S. policy and to plan for similar episodes in the future, we must first understand what is taking place in the Dominican Republic. What better source, then, than the views of five Latin American Ambassadors, from five exceedingly diverse Latin American countries, sent to the Dominican Republic in the official capacity of investigators of the OAS?

Here, then, are some of the highlights of their testimony.

The members of the Special Committee were asked to report on the degree of Communist infiltration in the rebel and junta forces. The Ambassadors of Argentina, Brazil, and Colombia all expressed their opinion that the degree of Communist infiltration had indeed reached worrisome proportions. Ambassador Colombo of Argentina revealed that Colonel Caamano himself recognized that Communist infiltration was a great problem for the rebels.

The delegate from Brazil put the situation this way:

Mr. President, to corroborate the affirmative answers just given by my colleagues from Colombia and Argentina and add an aspect which I believe can help to clear the focus that can be given to this problem, I wish to say, Seniors Special Delegates, that with the total collapse of public authority—since neither the forces of the junta of government (Benoit, Santana and Saladin), nor those of Colonel Caamano controlled the situation—the Dominican State practically disappeared as a jurisdictional-political entity, dissolving into a kind of no-man's land. The arsenal had been handed out to the people, and all of the disoriented population, adolescents and fanatics, carried modern automatic armaments, in an excited state which was even more exacerbated by constant radio broadcasts of obvious subversive character. Neither I, nor any of the members of this Committee, I believe, am in condition to assert with assurance that the movement of Colonel Caamano, backed by the really popular figure of ex-President Bosch, is an essentially Communist movement. But one fact is indisputable: during the state of true anarchy in which the country was engulfed for various days, especially the capital, where bands of snipers sacked, killed, and did not obey anyone, whatever organized group disembarked on the Island could have dominated the situation. For that reason, and on this the majority of the chiefs of foreign missions there agree, all the members of the Committee are in accord in admitting that the movement of Caamano, although authentically democratic in its origins, since none of us believe sincerely that Caamano is a Communist, could rapidly have

been converted into a Communist insurrection.

The special delegate from Uruguay—Senor Oribe—asked whether the situation is such that it would endanger the peace and security of the hemisphere.

As you know, Mr. President, collective action by the inter-American system can be invoked only in the case that the peace and security of the hemisphere are endangered. Otherwise, collective as well as unilateral action would be considered intervention in the internal affairs of a member state, and hence prohibited by Charter of the OAS.

In answer to this crucial question, the special delegate from Colombia replied:

The first question is: Is the situation such that it endangers the peace and security? My answer is "Yes;" yes, there exists a situation which endangers the peace and security. The reasons are very clear. A disturbance or even a war in one member state is not the same where there exist elements of order and constituted authority as in a state where one can see, one can judge the degree of, and one can document the absence of constituted authority. What to do, Senor Delegate, faced with the absence of a state? What does the (Inter-American) system do when a state does not exist? What happens when blood is flowing through the streets; what happens, Senor Delegate, when an American country—and I am going to speak frankly so that your Excellency meditates with all the clarity that we recognize you possess—if those conditions are found, in the vicinity of Cuba? Do we sit in the balcony to watch the last act of the tragedy? Do we sit as in a bullring awaiting the entrance of the matador and his crew? What to do, Senor Delegate? We are in a movement of the struggle of international communism; and we are in the world, Senor Delegate, and America is not separated even by the sea from other continents. The Dominican Republic, as any country in America, is a part of the (Inter-American) system, and it is the system which will suffer when any of its members is headless. The problem we face is not one of juridical concepts, subject to an exact legal interpretation. The problem is one of deep political significance, of continental importance, much graver than that of any of the other American revolutions.

Mr. President, the five OAS delegates, all of them Latin Americans themselves, have performed a magnificent service for inter-American peace and solidarity. They have, in a very real sense, vindicated President Johnson's decision to act quickly in the Dominican situation.

Now the question of the future of the Dominican Republic has moved on to an inter-American stage. The OAS Special Committee has declared that, in the anarchic situation in the Dominican Republic, there existed the danger of a Communist takeover. Hence, the OAS presence in the Dominican Republic is warranted as a counterforce to extra-continental intervention in an American Republic.

The question which the OAS must now face concerns returning that tragic little American Republic to a semblance of peace. It is not enough to have nipped off an impending Communist subversion. I believe that the OAS now has the responsibility to protect the Dominican people from either a tyranny of the left or the right. The prospect of a Communist tyranny should not be an excuse to permit the establishment of an ab-

May 10, 1965

horrent dictatorship of the Trujillo stripe.

The United States, having intervened to stave off a Communist dictatorship, cannot now abandon the Dominican people. The OAS, having in effect condoned the U.S. intervention and turned it into a collective action, now must assume the responsibility for assuring that the Dominican people do indeed get the opportunity to exercise those democratic rights upon which the Charter of the OAS is based.

It is my understanding that the meeting at present in progress will concern itself with the next collective steps to be taken in the Dominican Republic. As is clear from a reading of the discussion by the members of the Special Committee, both sides in the present conflict in the Dominican Republic respect the inter-American system, have faith in it, and desire to cooperate with it. This augurs well for any imaginative attempt by the OAS to proceed to the tough task of reconstruction.

I do not underestimate the tremendous problem ahead in any collective effort to help the Dominican people on the path of attaining a viable, democratic government. But I am convinced that the effort must be made. I fervently hope that the Council of the OAS, presently meeting, will hasten to establish a committee of distinguished hemispheric citizens to serve as advisers and counselors in the Dominican Republic until such time as democratic elections can be held to record the voice of the Dominican people.

As soon as I can obtain a translation of the May 7-8 session of the OAS, I shall insert it in the RECORD. It is required reading for all those who wish to know what really transpired in the Dominican Republic that led the United States to risk the opprobrium of our Latin American friends by landing U.S. marines on Latin American soil for the first time in a generation.

In short, we may be on the eve of a great turn of events in the history of American relations. If these materialize as a result of President Johnson's swift action coupled with his efforts to get the Organization of American States to take over, then the tragic losses of life in the Dominican Republic may not have been in vain. This could well be the most important change in hemispheric policy since President Roosevelt's declaration of the good-neighbor policy early in his administration and his subsequent efforts to make the Monroe Doctrine, as he termed it, "a joint concern" of all the American Republics.

The President, as we know, has been in touch with the outstanding apostles of democracy in the Latin American world: Romulo Betancourt, the great ex-President of Venezuela; José Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; a figure of international standing; and our own Luis Muñoz-Marín who has written a bright page of history in the Caribbean. In the case of Muñoz-Marín, it has always been regretted by those who appreciated his great statesmanship that it could not have been exercised on a scale larger than a small island—Puerto Rico. Maybe the

opportunity has now come for him to put his great talents and vision to work in behalf of the whole hemisphere.

Finally, let me say again that President Johnson is to be commended for his swift statesmanship and action in the Caribbean, although I find it difficult to understand the size of the military commitment that has been made. But as of now, we must all hope that a hemispheric organization will move in, and, as I said on the floor of the Senate last Thursday, relieve the United States both of the responsibility and the onus of unilateral intervention.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement previously entered, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 10, 1965:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Harold B. Beaton, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice George E. Hill, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mercer Cook, of Illinois, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to The Gambia.

Ridgway B. Knight, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

George A. Morgan, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast.

Bailey N. Taylor, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Ronald I. Spiers, of Vermont, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Godfrey Harvey Summ, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Morris H. Crawford, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class

3, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Fredrick C. Ashley, of Ohio.

John M. Beshaar, of Colorado.

Warren Clark, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Raymond H. Collins, of Missouri.

Wilfred F. Declercq, of Missouri.

Roger R. Gamble, of New Mexico.

Richard E. Ginnold, of Washington.

Kenneth Allen Hartung, of New York.

Arthur D. Levin, of Rhode Island.

Charles T. Magee, of the District of Columbia.

Edward Michael Sacchet, of Maryland.

Cameron H. Sanders, Jr., of New York.

William L. Swing, of North Carolina.

Norman E. Terrell, of Washington.

Miss Lenore E. Westfahl, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Paul G. Berry, of Maine.

Kenneth W. Bleakley, of New York.

Duane C. Butcher, of Oklahoma.

David P. N. Christensen, of Nevada.

Jared J. Collard, of Washington.

Lowell R. Fleischer, of Ohio.

Richard M. Greene, Jr., of California.

George H. Haines III, of New York.

Lauren Wells Jackson, of New Jersey.

Charles E. Lahiguera, of Rhode Island.

Thomas G. Martin, of Alabama.

Shirl F. McArthur, of Washington.

Joseph D. McLaughlin, of Kansas.

Donald E. Mudd, of the District of Columbia.

Bruce S. Pansey, of Rhode Island.

Irwin Pernick, of New York.

Gordan R. Powers, of Idaho.

John P. Riley, of New Jersey.

Miss Ruth M. Schimel, of New York.

John F. Simmons, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Gilbert J. Sperling, of Pennsylvania.

Thomas Ronald Sykes, of Illinois.

Paul Daniel Taylor, of New York.

Thaddeus C. Trzyna, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Sydney Goldsmith, of New Jersey.

Alphonse F. LaPorta, of New York.

Stephen C. Lesser, of California.

Miss Sheila-Kaye O'Connell, of Massachusetts.

John H. Penfold, of Colorado.

Bruce C. Rogers, of New York.

Theodor Rumme, of Massachusetts.

James W. Shinn, of California.

James E. Taylor, of California.

John Way Vincent, of Illinois.

Miss Sarah D. Wilkinson, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William E. Barreda, of Texas.

David L. Blakemore, of New York.

Colby Cornish Coombs, of Massachusetts.

James J. Ehrman, of Wisconsin.

Thomas P. Gallagher, of New Jersey.

Arthur H. Hughes, of Nebraska.

Richard L. Jackson, of Massachusetts.

Dennis W. Keogh, of the District of Columbia.

Peter S. Maher, of Illinois.

Gene B. Marshall, of New Hampshire.

Richard Keller McKee, of Illinois.

Walter M. Notheis, of California.

John E. Crond, Jr., of Rhode Island.

Aian Parker, of Kansas.

Albert J. Planagan, of New York.

Bruce F. Porter, of Iowa.

Mark S. Ramée, of New York.

A2270

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 10, 1965

In Cooperation With OAS**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of Tuesday, May 4, 1965, in its lead editorial, commented on the situation and developments in the Dominican Republic.

The Inquirer supports the action taken by President Johnson in his decision to send U.S. troops in there immediately in order to save the lives of countless men, women, and children, many of them U.S. citizens.

In addition, the Inquirer states that "the peril in the Dominican Republic is precisely the kind of crisis in which the Organization of American States is solemnly pledged to respond."

The editorial follows:

IN COOPERATION WITH OAS

Joint action by nations of the Western Hemisphere, utilizing the administrative and diplomatic machinery of the Organization of American States, offers the best hope of resolving the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Proposals by the United States on Monday, enlisting the participation of other Latin American countries in emergency peace-keeping operations, under OAS auspices, point the way to proper and effective handling of an extremely grave situation.

There are several urgent elements in the Dominican turmoil and each of them requires decisive and immediate attention. In each instance the authority to act lies clearly with the OAS. President Johnson is moving in the right direction in calling upon the Organization to exercise its authority as expeditiously as possible.

Responsibilities for ending the bloodshed in the Dominican Republic, and safeguarding hemispheric interests there, should be assumed by the OAS swiftly so the United States may be relieved of its interim role of unilateral intervention that was undertaken to save thousands of persons from an imminent threat of mass slaughter by Communist-inspired terrorists.

As President Johnson said, in his televised report to the American people Sunday night, "We have acted to summon the resources of this entire hemisphere to this task." He defended his decision to send U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic, without waiting for OAS action, on humanitarian grounds. "I knew there was no time to talk, to consult or to delay," the President emphasized. To have hesitated would have been to condemn countless men and women to "die in the streets."

Communist efforts to capitalize on the Dominican upheaval for their own purposes are not surprising. It is the classic Communist strategy of turning chaos into opportunity. The OAS has placed itself on public record several times in opposition to Communist infiltration and aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

One such occasion was in January of 1962, at the OAS meeting in Uruguay, when several resolutions in condemnation of Communism were adopted. President Johnson made appropriate reference to one of these resolutions in his address Sunday night.

The peril in the Dominican Republic is precisely the kind of crisis in which the Organization of American States is solemnly pledged to respond. Such response should have solid support from the United States

and other OAS members and should be sufficiently firm to assure both peace and freedom for the Dominican people—within a framework of self-government free of foreign dictation from anywhere.

**Medical Association of Georgia Selects
Georgian General Practitioner of the
Year****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to advise the House that a high honor has been bestowed upon the father of one of our distinguished colleagues, ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

The House of Delegates of the Medical Association of Georgia just recently selected Dr. Robert G. Stephens, of Washington, Wilkes County, Ga., as the General Practitioner of the Year for the State of Georgia.

Dr. Stephens has been dedicated to the noble practice of medicine for 60 years, and I am proud to insert in the RECORD a splendid article about his selection as General Practitioner of the Year:

**MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA SELECTS
GEORGIAN GENERAL PRACTITIONER OF THE
YEAR**

AUGUSTA, GA.—The House of Delegates of the Medical Association of Georgia at its annual session at the Augusta Town House on May 2-4 selected Dr. Robert G. Stephens, of Washington, Wilkes County, Ga., the "General Practitioner of the Year." Dr. Stephens, father of Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., of the 10th District, was nominated by the Wilkes County Medical Society and endorsed by the Richmond County Medical Society. The award was made on May 4 to the honoree at the afternoon session. Congressman and Mrs. Stephens flew from Washington, D.C., for the ceremony and one daughter, Mrs. J. Mason Williams, Jr., came from Perry, Fla., while Dr. Stephens was accompanied by his daughter, Mrs. Lucian Wilson, who lives with him.

The Medical Society of Georgia, founded in 1849, through its committee chairman, Dr. Hubert Milford of Hartwell, cited Dr. Stephens for his 60 years of service with these words:

"Dr. Stephens has practiced medicine for 60 years. Sixty years of unselfish devotion to the practice of a profession that he considers a calling. He practices the type of medicine that is attempted by many but achieved by few. He keeps abreast of the best medical practice and shares his knowledge unselfishly for the benefit of the rich and poor alike. He has been an inspiration to those of us who have had the privilege of working with him since he started practice.

"Dr. Stephens was born in Crawfordville, Taliaferro County, Ga., on June 17, 1881, the youngest of four children born to John Alexander Stephens and his wife, Mary Emma Stephens. Of noble lineage, he was the nephew of Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, an outstanding Southern statesman. He received his primary education in Washington, Ga., and later in Atlanta. He is a graduate of the University of Georgia, and while there, was outstanding in its activities, having been associate editor of the Pandora and treasurer of

the athletic association. He graduated from the university in 1902, with an A.B. degree. He then entered medical school at the Atlanta College of Physicians and Surgeons, from which he graduated April 3, 1905, with an M.D. degree. While there, he was instrumental in establishing the chapter of Chi Zeta Chi medical fraternity, and in 1910, at the national convention of this fraternity, he was elected to supreme historian of the national council and held this position for a number of years.

"It is of interest that Dr. Stephens was the first resident physician of Wesley Memorial Hospital, which at that time was on Courtland Street in Atlanta, where it remained until 1918, when it was relocated in a large and up-to-date new plant on the campus of Emory University, where its name was later changed to Emory University Hospital.

"When Dr. Stephens finished his residency, he started his practice as contract physician and surgeon for a lumber company in Silver Springs, Fla. He returned to Atlanta, January 1907, where he started in private practice in the general practice of medicine. Soon after his start in practice, he became adjunct professor of physiology at the Atlanta Medical College which was the forerunner of Emory Medical School and later acted also as chief of the outpatient department.

"While engaged in the teaching of physiology, Dr. Stephens revised and brought up-to-date 'Jones' Outline of Physiology' and this was published under the title of 'Outlines of Physiology' by Jones and Stephens. It was used as a textbook of physiology at numerous medical schools.

"In 1910, Dr. Stephens was elected to the position of medical director of the Atlanta public schools, which he held until 1915, at which time he refused reelection in order to return to the full-time practice of medicine. He did general practice in Atlanta, in Fulton County, Decatur, in DeKalb County, and in Old Campbell County and in portions of Cobb County. During this time he was on the staff at Crawford W. Long Hospital and had privileges in every hospital in Atlanta until the time of his removal to his old family home in Washington, Ga., in 1938, where he has served his community and followed the practice of his uncle, Dr. Robert A. Simpson, who died that year. His honors have been many. Besides the aforementioned honors and achievements he has served on the faculty of the Atlanta Medical College and on the staff of Grady Hospital. He was on the board of trustees at the Carnegie Library in Atlanta for 10 years, serving as its chairman for 6 years. He has served as president of the Washington, Ga., Kiwanis Club. He has twice served as president of the Wilkes County Medical Society and as chief of staff of the Washington General Hospital. He is a member of the board of trustees of the Mary Willis Library in Washington and chairman of the board for 16 years. Dr. Stephens is Presbyterian; while in Atlanta he was a ruling elder of the Druid Hills Presbyterian Church for 26 years. He is now a member of the Washington Presbyterian Church where he has served as a ruling elder for 26 years. During World War II, he was appointed by the Governor to serve on the Selective Service appeal board No. 3 and for 5 years was a member of that board.

"In 1907, Dr. Stephens married Miss Lucy Evans, of Atlanta, a daughter of Gen. Clement A. Evans and from this union was born four children. Three girls, Mrs. Dudley W. Reynolds, of Atlanta, Mrs. Lucian C. Wilson, of Washington, Ga., and Mrs. Mason Williams, Jr., of Perry, Fla. One son, ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., of Athens, Ga., now serving as a Member of Congress from the 10th District of Georgia.

"As a final note let it be said that Dr. Stephens is still active in the practice of medicine, going day and night attending to

educating the top 25 percent in academic ability.

He pointed out that students are paid stipends to attend undergraduate schools and pay no tuition, room or board.

The 75 percent who are not admitted to universities enroll in vocational or technical schools or take correspondence courses. Some will apply again to the universities.

Hoglan believes that a young Russian who is not admitted to the university has a very small chance of getting a good job and advancing himself.

The Russian school system does not offer many opportunities to students in rural areas. Education seldom goes beyond the fourth grade there. Hoglan recalled that one Russian official dismissed this fact by saying: "If a student in the country really wants an education, we will send him to a boarding school."

The youth organizations of the Soviet Union impressed Hoglan. He emphasized that all extracurricular activities are sponsored by independently staffed and financed Government agencies. The youth groups are indoctrination agencies of the Government, he added.

Communist youth programs, he added, are much more extensive and intensive than ours because of more money and personnel. He pointed out that our full-time teachers must double as extracurricular advisers.

Children in the primaries join the Octobrists; those in secondary grades, the Young Pioneers. A selected number of pioneers join Komsomol, the stepping stone to the Communist Party and elite status, he said.

Secondary schools require each student to take four languages. Hoglan explained that the Soviet language program is stronger than ours partly because their need is greater.

He noted that a trip from Tbilisi, Georgia, to Kiev in the U.S.S.R.—a distance equal to that between Denver and Marshalltown—would take a Russian from an area speaking Georgian to Kiev, where Russian is the native tongue.

Voice of Modern History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. McDowell. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Charlotte Shedd, one of my constituents, who conducts a regular program on radio station WDEL in Wilmington, Del., forcefully and eloquently set forth her personal views in a May 3 broadcast. Her remarks were based on her personal experience and knowledge of the ruthless forces of totalitarianism, and hers is, therefore, an authentic voice of modern history.

I take this opportunity to share her views with my colleagues, and I include the text of her broadcast remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

VOICE OF MODERN HISTORY

Mine is but a voice in the wilderness, a small voice, lost in the hum of 190 million voices that fill this land from ocean to ocean, from border to border, from hills to plains, in the valleys, and on the mountaintops. And a woman's voice at that.

But nevertheless it is a voice of a citizen of the United States of America. A citizen not by birth but by choice. The choice decided by the system of government and the

freedom of its institutions offered to one like myself—that very freedom indeed which at this moment permits me to express my view and my emotions freely through the medium of a free press and radio.

I am concerned about this freedom, I know what it is like to be without it. You do not. You have never sat in your livingroom and listened to your President announce in a voice filled with tears and breaking with emotion: "foreign troops are crossing our borders, to avoid unnecessary bloodshed I have ordered to cease all resistance; God save—well, in my case it was—Austria."

You have never sat there, stunned at the news, your throat choked with fear, your heart beating wildly, listening, listening for the sound of the conquerors' boots. And they came; the conqueror—with tanks and planes and guns and with truncheons, and chains and tortures and death.

And they had their lists of people who at one time or another had voiced opposition to dictatorship; who were known to be hostile to the conqueror. And the knocks began on the doors of the citizens at 4 o'clock in the morning, "open up—Gestapo." And the fathers and sons and brothers and daughters did not return from shopping trips because they had been picked up in the streets, denounced by their neighbors who thus gave vent to a personal grudge.

You don't know all of this, and I hope and pray you never will. But don't think, don't let yourself be lulled into thinking, it cannot happen here; it can and it will if we permit Communist infiltration of our neighbors to the south. One by one, the plan prescribes, one by one they are to be converted to Communist strongholds. Its all the same, remember how Hitler did it? One by one, the Saar, the Sudetenland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Polish Corridor. One by one, Cuba, Panama, the Dominican Republic, maybe Guatemala, Venezuela, until one day the whole of South America would explode—while from the north the Russian Bear would form a perfect pincers movement to obliterate our country as we know it.

That is why it was the imperative duty of the President to finally act, to say: enough, we have taken enough, we cannot sit by any longer and watch disaster overtake us, enough of the "nibble campaign," this means life or death for our future.

Naturally Castro screams; naturally, the Red press of Europe screams; naturally, our own fellow travelers scream and bemoan our actions—they were gleefully happy when our honor was soiled during the Hungarian crisis, they rubbed their hands when we didn't do in Cuba what we are now doing in the Dominican Republic. They are the Trojan horse, the fifth column, the quislings, or have you forgotten these terms in the past 20 peaceful years?

Don't forget. And be proud and grateful that you have at the helm of your country a man who has not forgotten, who knows the danger, who has the power and who uses it well, who above all is keenly conscious of the honor and responsibility of being, and remaining, a free American.

Paul Harvey: How Long Before the South Will Be Forgiven?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ABC's Paul Harvey delivered a magnificent editorial in tribute to the

South in his evening broadcast last week. In view of the unwarranted criticism often directed at my region, I found his remarks most gratifying.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the Record, I insert his editorial for the information of the Congress:

BROADCAST BY PAUL HARVEY—ABC—CHICAGO

How long before the South will be forgiven? Only a part of the abuse which is heaped on Dixie relates to race discrimination. Another large part relates to North-South discrimination.

Why is the race problem North and South, but the pressure is most on the South? How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since Germany fought us the last time, we've forgiven them and sent them \$4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese \$2½ billion.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia, and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those States to pay to Washington six times as much as they receive in "aid."

The economic jealousy which was, in large part, responsible for the uncivil war is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today, they have freedom, seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us—except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Vietnam reparations in advance—a billion dollars aid per year if southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing to accept a cease-fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever—is still occupied by "the enemy."

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are no threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambition beyond their borders. Indeed, you never even hear of a retired southerner moving north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexplicably bad manners. It would engender resentment.

It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet, Washington approves and applauds the invasion of our own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake. It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam's former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn't it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn't three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb's grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

in Washington, D.C., 14 employees are kept busy rewrapping broken packages. Recently, the St. Paul post office was smashing 25 hamper of packages daily. When this forced them to return to human labor, the rate dropped to one hamper per day.

What's behind all these shortcomings in the mail service these days?

MR. KEATING. Lack of manpower, primarily. Reduced use of railroads is another reason. The Post Office now has taken the position that sorting of mail in transit, as done in the railway mail cars, is no longer necessary. All of this means not only poor service, but more and more overtime. Some postal workers now spend 80 hours a week on the job. That is a waste of money, because a man cannot work efficiently that long.

That brings up the question of postal employee morale. What's the picture there?

MR. KEATING. It could hardly be worse. Postal employees are trying to do a job they cannot do because there are not enough of them. But, of course, they get the blame for poor service. Employees are being worked to their physical limits and are suffering in many ways. In the Atlanta region, there were 55,840 hours of work lost over seven pay periods. Many accidents were due to physical and mental exhaustion. Employees in the Denver post office have been requested to cancel annual leave. In Hays, Kans., all annual leave has been canceled. It is impossible to begin to tell of all instances where men are compelled to carry their own mail route and part of another one.

What's your answer to these problems?

MR. KEATING. The postal service needs more manpower, particularly the appointment of full-time career employees to a greater extent. Equipment and management techniques were supposed to improve service, reduce manpower. But frankly, they looked better in the show window than they have worked inside the store. ABCD (same day business delivery) has delayed as much or more mail than it expedited. It has turned out to be a mere gimmick. Much more has been expected from the ZIP code than it can produce. The program depends upon a machine, the optical scanner, which has not even been completely invented—and when invented will have many shortcomings. The main trouble is that the Post Office Department has been laying off people in anticipation of automation before the automated machines have arrived.

Robert E. Kennedy Named Sun-Times Associate Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1965

MR. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today a most welcome announcement which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times disclosing that Robert E. Kennedy, chief editorial writer of that publication since 1950, has been named associate editor. In making the announcement Mr. Milburn P. Akers praised Mr. Kennedy for the objectivity with which he approaches every editorial problem.

It has been my privilege to know Robert E. Kennedy for more than a quarter of a century. During all of these years I have seen Mr. Kennedy exemplify the highest principles of American journal-

ism. He has always been a credit to his profession, and I am sure that his many friends throughout the Nation will be happy to learn of his very well deserved promotion.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times announcement follows:

**ROBERT E. KENNEDY NAMED SUN-TIMES
ASSOCIATE EDITOR**

Robert E. Kennedy was named associate editor of the Sun-Times Saturday. The appointment, effective immediately, was announced by Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Sun-Times.

In making the announcement, Akers said, "I have been associated with Robert Kennedy for more than a quarter of a century. He is a very able and widely experienced newspaperman, an excellent student of public affairs and, equally important, one possessed of an intelligent compassion for the underprivileged and the oppressed. The objectivity with which he approaches every editorial problem is unsurpassed."

Kennedy has been chief editorial writer of the Sun-Times since 1950. During this period he has traveled extensively in the United States and abroad to observe firsthand political and economic conditions in this country, Europe, and Latin America.

In 1947 he became a charter member of the National Conference of Editorial Writers and served as chairman for 1957-58. He was president of the Chicago Press Club in 1963.

In 1954 Kennedy won the TWA Aviation Award for editorials on travel. His editorials were included in those for which the Sun-Times won the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Award in 1956 and the Education Writers Association Award in 1957.

Kennedy began his career as a reporter for the City News Bureau in 1929. During the early 1930's he covered prohibition era gang murders, board of education affairs, politics, and such famous court trials as those of Roger Touhy and the late Samuel Insull.

After a stint as assistant city editor of the City News Bureau, Kennedy joined the Chicago Times in 1935 as night city editor. In 1938 he was made political editor and wrote a daily column, "Mugwump." Four years later he became chief of the Times' Washington bureau where he wrote a daily political column.

In 1954 he was named chief editorial writer for the Times. Five years later he assumed the post of chief editorial writer for the Sun-Times, a post he has held up to now.

D.P.

Free Elections, Not Anticommunism, Should Be Goal of U.S. Intervention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

MR. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we need some plain talk about the nature and morality of intervention because the action of the United States in the Dominican Republic these last 10 days has outstripped, or at least fails to correspond with the contemporary attitude about intervention.

Intervention in the internal affairs of other nations is strongly condemned. This principle is found in the U.N. Charter and it is even more explicitly stated in the Charter of the OAS. Yet we in-

tervene every day in the affairs of other nations. The total thrust and purpose of American foreign policy is aimed at influencing events in other nations ranging from our military strength designed to deter others from starting a war to economic assistance aimed at speeding development in the recipient nations.

These kinds of intervention have been acceptable and not thought to be inconsistent with the prohibitions contained in the various multilateral charters because they are peaceful in character. They do not employ force.

We are using force in South Vietnam. Intervention in South Vietnam has been justified on the ground that the insurgency war had external origins and continues to have outside support thereby constituting aggression within the meaning of the U.N. Charter. The charter permits us to intervene when there is aggression. We have not taken that claim before the U.N., however.

Today, we have taken another step. We are employing force in the Dominican Republic to quell a revolution which admittedly was of internal origin. We need to talk about these events and what they mean, because the quality of our leadership—its morality, if you will—is being called into serious question, both by our own citizens and abroad. We must reconcile our actions within the more fundamental values which are generally shared by mankind.

UNITED STATES AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In 1963 President Bosch, elected 7 months earlier and strongly supported by the United States, was overthrown by a military coup. We protested and suspended aid but did not send in the Marines.

In the past 10 days the United States did intervene in the Dominican Republic when a new revolution sought to restore President Bosch to power. We did so because of our fear of a possible Communist takeover in that revolution. But the hard truth is that most revolutionary movements seeking to oust a military sponsored or nondemocratically based government will contain some Communists. They may lean toward Moscow, toward Peiping, or they may be indigenous types. If they were in charge, they surely would not reestablish democratic institutions in that country. But how can we know with accuracy the role they are playing? One can assume that the more resistance encountered by the revolution the more the Communists move toward control. Yet their influence cannot be easily identified nor can we assess their prospective control if the revolution is successful.

One is not reassured by the cries from some within the United States that our own civil rights movement is Communist inspired, nor by the tendency in Latin America to classify social reformers generally as Communists, just as General Wessin with whom we are cooperating calls former President Bosch Communist, which he is not.

Thus, if the United States continues to use this rationale of a possible-Communist takeover for intervention, we are placed in a peculiar and untenable position. We do not intervene when demo-

A2278

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 10, 1965

cratic institutions are destroyed by a military takeover, but we do intervene when efforts are made to restore such institutions because of the inevitability of Communists attaching themselves to the cause.

This is a wholly unsatisfactory state of affairs. This type of assymetrical intervention can only lead to increasing isolation from our friends and increasing involvement in the civil wars of other countries.

The fundamental objections to forceful intervention come from the experience of mankind, particularly from the experience of those who have been the victims of intervention. Countries which have been under colonial control and countries which though emancipated have been subjected to the strong arm of the larger powers are particularly sensitive. We need only ask how we would feel if other powers were to intervene with force in our affairs.

NONINTERVENTION IS NOT AN ABSOLUTE PRINCIPLE

Yet it is perfectly plain that nonintervention is not an absolute principle paramount above all others. My clearest example is the genocide committed by the Nazis against the Jews. Who among us could ever again stand by and say this was no concern of ours? A contemporary example is the ruthless, uncivilized treatment which South Africa accords its non-European population. Nor can civilized people ignore the wholesale denial of political and personal rights by totalitarian governments on both the left and the right. In short, there are more compelling considerations to determine our conduct than that of non-intervention.

THE PROMOTION OF REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

The promotion of representative democracy as a form of government is one principle to which the principle of non-intervention must often give way. American foreign policy is bottomed on the belief that a world of democratic nations provides the most favorable environment for our own security. Our faith in the democratic process has deep pragmatic roots. The genius of this process is its ability to effect change without revolution. Moreover, experience has shown that governments which have a mature political process permitting the free exercise of the ballot are least likely to engage in military adventures and are most likely to add stability to the international community.

OAS NATIONS ARE COMMITTED TO PROMOTING DEMOCRACY

In the Western Hemisphere, to establish and maintain representative democracy is an important goal of the Organization of American States. In the Charter of Bogotá which set up the OAS in 1948 as a "regional agency within the U.N.," there appears the following language:

The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.

A conference of Western hemispheric nations was called in 1962 on this question. It is interesting to note that this

conference, called the "First Symposium on Representative Democracy," was held in Santo Domingo, capital of the Dominican Republic, from December 17 to 22, 1962. One of the activities of the conference was the observation of the December 20 election which brought that island its first representative government after 30 years of the Trujillo dictatorship.

It was the conclusion of that OAS symposium that "the other fundamental principles of the American regional system would become truly meaningful only insofar as all the member States adopted a vigorous constitutional policy favoring the establishment or consolidation of such a political system within their respective national territories."

So the principle is well established in our hemisphere to promote representative democracy.

INTERVENTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC MAY BE JUSTIFIED

The action of the United States in the Dominican Republic can be justified, in my opinion, if the basis for such intervention is explicitly stated as the need to preserve the right of the people to choose their own government. This statement needs to be followed by action consistent with this objective. If the United States promptly moves toward the holding of free elections and requests the OAS to take over in the interim, then I see the total effect of intervention resulting in the strengthening of democratic institutions on the island, the avoidance of bloodshed, and the will of the people being observed.

What must be avoided at all costs is the establishment of a client government dependent upon outside forces for support. This would utterly destroy any moral foundation for our action.

These steps in support of the right of the people to choose their own government would not be easy. The Dominican Republic lacks strong traditions of public service. It had barely the veneer of an effectively organized and functioning government.

Suppose that under OAS sponsorship an election is held and someone is elected President who finds himself unable to meet the demands of his people for adequate wages, employment, and economic progress. Then the country moves more closely toward another coup, revolution, or civil war? Then what is the role of the OAS or the United States?

There is no easy answer to this dilemma, and every course of action involves calculated risks. For my money, however, I would choose the right of self-government unrestricted except for a continuing guarantee to the people that their right to choose their own leaders would be respected and enforced. This would mean that a military coup or any other revolution would automatically bring forward OAS forces designed to enforce these basic constitutional processes. This is the kind of intervention which in my judgment is highly moral and is sorely needed.

Had this type of guarantee been in effect in 1963 President Bosch could have called upon the OAS or the United States for help in defending his constitutional right to his office. Such a procedure

would, of course, be giving free license to the people to vote into office good and bad presidents alike, some of whom might well damage the economy or welfare of the Nation. Unfortunate as this might be, there is no other acceptable solution which does not place our goals in serious jeopardy.

MULTILATERAL FORCE IS BEST

I have suggested that the OAS take on these new tasks, because multilateral intervention carries assurance that announced reasons for intervening are indeed genuine and unlikely to become subordinated to someone else's national interest. Confidence in the multilateral agency is thereby engendered. Moreover, the presence of multilateral forces favorably changes the psychology flowing from the use of force.

The prime example was the recruitment for use in the Congo of small nation forces which had no history of colonialism. Logistical support, on the other hand, was supplied by the larger nations. The same concepts applied in the Dominican Republic would be of enormous assistance.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Although the OAS seems the logical agency to effect a transition to a popularly elected government, the United Nations may be the logical vehicle for a major economic program which must surely follow the reestablishment of a democratic government in this country which suffers from illiteracy and high unemployment. The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, the U.N. Special Fund and Expanded Technical Assistance programs or the World Bank might well be asked to accept substantial development responsibilities in the Dominican Republic in cooperation with the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. This possibility should be explored because the United States should make perfectly clear to the world as well as to the Dominican Republic our willingness to employ multilateral agencies to carry out a program of economic assistance to which we will make substantial contributions rather than insist on a bilateral aid relationship.

The possibility of the United Nations becoming the multilateral agency to intervene in support of free elections needs further consideration. The OAS Charter provisions are explicit in rejecting such a role today—but they can be changed. The U.N. Charter provisions are not so explicit and in the case of the Congo the U.N. found a way to intervene. For the moment the political problems within the U.N. probably preclude such a role, leaving regional organizations such as the OAS and the OAU in the best position to act if they will. There is no inherent reason, however, why the U.N. should not act when requested to act by a freely chosen government which is threatened by forces within the country.

UNITED STATES MUST ANNOUNCE ITS OBJECTIVE OF FREE ELECTIONS

Some implications which follow from this examination of our intervention in the Dominican Republic are inescapable. We need to firmly fix in our minds and announce to the world that our objective

is the preservation of the right of people to choose their own government. It is in these terms that we must justify the use of force, and not on the grounds of anticomunism. Moreover, this requires a reexamination of our position on coups which are committed by the military forces in these countries.

It is my fervent hope that events in the Dominican Republic will cause this Nation to take a good, hard look at what it really seeks to do—and then to speak the truth. If a fundamental reexamination follows these events it may bring a new surge of enthusiasm and commitment to the enormous undertakings of this Nation across the globe.

WE ARE AT A CROSSROADS

It is my considered judgment that the United States stands at one of its most crucial crossroads since World War II. The energetic application of force by President Johnson has filled a vacuum, but like the genie in the bottle, we may have uncorked an ill spirit which can do more damage to the United States than any other single action taken since the end of World War II. People across this entire globe will be watching with close attention the steps now taken by our Government. If there was ever a time when the fundamental morality of our Nation had to be demonstrated, that time is now. This fundamental morality must be pursued vigorously to its logical conclusion despite the calculated risks which are involved.

The Organization of American States likewise stands at a crossroads. The doctrine of nonintervention uncritically accepted these past decades must now be reexamined with eyes which also comprehend the enormous moral implications of the events which are unfolding. If the OAS meets these challenges, it can literally transform this hemisphere with new relationships which recognize man's responsibility to man and our mutual interdependence in our common efforts to secure the blessings of freedom for posterity.

The Importance of Job Vacancy Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee have been urging the administration to do a statistical survey on job vacancies to serve as a critical tool of economic policymaking. Work on this project has now begun. At the same time, the National Industrial Conference Board has been conducting its own pilot studies in this area, the first results of which were announced in the Washington Post of May 10.

In a Rochester, N.Y., study, the NICB found 8,000 job vacancies for an estimated job vacancy rate of 3 percent of the work force. When the NICB elimi-

nated those jobs that would be available at some date beyond the cutoff date of the study, the job vacancy rate was 1.9 percent. Comparing these figures to Rochester's 2.7 percent unemployment rate presents a convincing demonstration of how in at least one labor market area, the number of jobs going begging equals or even surpasses the number of people unemployed.

This information makes strikingly clear the dangers inherent in trying to pump up aggregate demand in order to reduce unemployment without knowledge of the number of job vacancies existing in the economy. It lends new urgency to the need for such data which has been expressed by Prof. Arthur Burns, Prof. Raymond Saulnier, and other distinguished economists.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post, to which I referred be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

JOB VACANCIES STUDY ADDS FUEL TO POLICY CONTROVERSY

(By Frank C. Porter, Washington Post staff writer)

New fuel for a continuing argument over national economic policy was supplied yesterday by the National Industrial Conference Board, which said a pilot study indicates the significance of job vacancy statistics.

The finding bolsters the case of some conservative economists, who contend that unemployment figures as a determinant of Government policy are misleading unless comparable statistics on unfilled job opening are also considered.

Other economists have argued that job vacancy figures are uncollectible in a form precise enough to be useful—largely because too many employers are unwilling to furnish the information.

But the NICB, a business-backed research organization, claimed yesterday that "a high rate of employer response can be obtained."

It released the first part of a pilot study in which it surveyed 401 employers in the Rochester, N.Y., area and found some 8,000 job vacancies as of February 12.

NICB reported 33 percent of the openings were for professional and managerial talent; 22 percent for semiskilled workers, 17 percent for skilled, 14 for clerical and sales, 7 percent for service, and 6 percent for unskilled workers.

Despite the demand for professional types, the survey found that in 58 percent of the vacancies, employers were willing to accept those with no related work experience. And in more than a third, no high school diploma was required.

As a result of the survey, Rochester's job vacancy rate was estimated at 3 percent of the work force. Eliminating those jobs available at some future date, the rate would be 1.9 percent. The area's unemployment rate was 2.7 percent at the time, NICB said.

The small spread between the job vacancy and unemployment rate goes to the nub of the argument set forth by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower. Writing recently in the Harvard Business Review, Burns took issue with the longstanding policy of basing stimulative Federal monetary and fiscal policies on the basis of a high unemployment rate alone without any reference to existing job vacancies.

The Burns theory can be put this way. Faced with an alarming 7-percent unemployment rate, a nation might resort to deficit financing and low interest rates to perk up the economy and take up the manpower slack.

But supposing the job vacancy rate was also 7 percent. This would indicate as many unfilled positions as idle workers. And it would suggest either or both of two conditions: (a) imperfections in the machinery of matching men or jobs, and (b) lack of qualifications among the unemployed to fit them for the vacant jobs.

Under these conditions, Burns argued, the Government's stimulative policy would have little impact on unemployment; rather would it aggravate a skilled manpower shortage through increasing demand and thus produce inflation.

Some liberal economists, in addition to being dubious about the usefulness of job vacancy figures, fear they might be used as a political tool to squelch or cut back economic stimuli and other policies to relieve unemployment.

But H. Bruce Palmer, NICB president, noted yesterday that "job vacancy information has been collected and published regularly in most of the developed countries.

"Our ultimate goal is the development of at least as good a measure of the demand for labor as we now have for the supply of labor," he said. "Although final judgment must await the completion of two additional surveys later this year, it seems apparent at this point that a meaningful count of job vacancies can be made."

Los Angeles City Council Opposes Dirksen Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Los Angeles City Council, I am proud to report its unanimous opposition to proposals which would overturn the one-man one-vote rule. The action of the Los Angeles City Council and of many other representative governmental bodies and organizations throughout our Nation is encouraging evidence that the voice of the people will be heard and that attempts to write permission for unfair legislative apportionment into the Constitution will be defeated. The text of the council resolution follows:

Whereas the central right of all men who live in a self-governing society is the right to vote; and

Whereas the form of a self-governing society is nothing but a pretense and a deception to the extent that its structure actually operates to grant to its members an unequal voice in the conduct of their public business; and

Whereas citizens of the populous counties of California have an unjustifiably unequal voice in the conduct of their affairs because an amendment to the California constitution was adopted in 1926 for the purpose of perpetuating the political dominance over the affairs of this State which the northern counties of California enjoyed by reason of their population in the 19th century; and this was done through the device of diluting the strength of the votes of persons residing within the rapidly growing heavily populated counties of the south; and

Whereas the citizens of Los Angeles County, now totaling nearly 7 million in number, are entitled by reason of their population to more than 15 State senators, but have suf-

May 10, 1965

A2280

ferred by reason of the dilution of their voting influence to the extent that now they have but one senator, and the vote of a citizen in the sparsely settled areas of the State is inflated to the extent that it may have as much as 450 times the influence in the State senate as does the vote of a citizen in Los Angeles County; and

Whereas despite court ruling that this injustice must end, an active and well-financed campaign to preserve the present system is being carried on by members of the California State senate and a member of California interests which seek to preserve the present system through which a minority of less than 11 percent of the people can effectively control the State senate; and

Whereas Members of Congress are being actively solicited to adopt measures making it possible for minority control to continue in California, and there is danger that this campaign of propaganda, if not forcefully contradicted, may persuade even Congressmen from those districts of California which are most severely discriminated against that the people of the heavily populated counties are content with the present intolerable situation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Los Angeles advise California's Senators and all Members of Congress elected from the County of Los Angeles:

1. The Council of the City of Los Angeles without a dissenting vote has advised the State legislature that it favors the creation at an early date of Senate districts in this State based upon the judicially approved principle of substantially equal population.

2. The city of Los Angeles requests the Congress not to adopt any amendment to the U.S. Constitution which, by superseding the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, or otherwise, would make it possible for a State legislature, whether supported by a majority vote of the people or not, to be so organized that the equality of the weight and influence of one citizen's vote upon the State's legislative processes is substantially different from the weight or influence of another's merely because he lives in a different place, engages in a different means of livelihood, or belongs to any class or group whose existence has no relationship to his status as a citizen.

Chicago's Radio and Television Industry Honors Ralph Atlass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Broadcast Pioneers Organization awarded its annual achievement award to Mr. Ralph Atlass, vice president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., and founder of radio station WIND in Chicago.

Several hundred leading figures in the radio and television industry joined in the tribute to Mr. Atlass, who has scored with several of the "firsts" in the development of the radio industry.

Mr. Howard Miller, one of Chicago's most distinguished radio and television personalities, served as master of ceremonies at this inspiring banquet.

I should like to include in the RECORD today, Mr. Miller's eloquent tribute to

Mr. Ralph Atlass, and I should also like to include in the RECORD today, the names of those illustrious Chicagoans who sat at the main table in honoring Mr. Atlass.

Those joining in the tribute represented a cross section of Chicago's leading personalities in the radio and television industry.

The head table guest list included the following:

Bob Larsen, Chuck Bill, Daddy-O Daylie, Josh Brady, Merv Griffin, Gene Taylor, Capt. Bill Eddy, Virginia Gale, Bob Atcher, John Dorenus, Norman Ross, Paul Gibson, John Harrington, John Moser, Dan Calibraro.

Souk Hettler, Don McNeill, Larry Wolters, Ed Wallis, Howard Miller, Ralph Atlass, Jim Beach, Jack Brickhouse, Irv Kupcinet, Ernie Shonie, Lee Phillip, Jack Bowen, Franklyn Macformack, Eddie Hubbard, Fahey Flynn.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Miller's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY HOWARD MILLER AT THE RALPH ATLAS TESTIMONIAL BANQUET, APRIL 23, 1965

Unlike Marc Anthony, who appeared in the Roman Senate to bury Caesar, not to praise him, we here admit that our privilege is to praise Ralph Atlass, not to bury him; because today, Ralph Atlass is as vital to our industry as he has been since 1924, when he brought a facility out of a basement in his home in Lincoln, Ill., a facility which was born a decade earlier in the mind of an 11-year-old boy, only to become radio station WBBM. Since then, for these intervening 41 years, he has continued to make substantial contributions to our thinking and to the art and science of radio communications. Perhaps it is not wise to list accomplishments of one so alive for fear a hearer might believe the contributions have ended—notting could be further from the truth—but for the historians, let me recite just a few of the firsts achieved by Ralph Atlass:

First public service shows in conjunction with the AMA in 1924, first courtroom broadcasts in 1929, first schoolroom of the air, first exclusive baseball broadcasts, first broadcast of a baseball road game, first coincidental listening survey—the birth of our rating services.

There are just too many more to list here, but Ralph's biggest first was his introduction of a format or broadcast philosophy which is now practiced by over 95 percent of all the radio stations in the United States, the music and news format. It was in 1940, a quarter century ago, that Ralph Atlass decided radio could, and radio should do a better job for our "citizenry"; a quarter century ago that he determined radio, as we knew it then, was overdue for an overhaul. With emphasis on public service, he introduced music 24 hours a day with news every half hour.

Now these are the firsts which the documentarians can and will talk about. But so that we don't miss the real story, as an employee, associate, and I am proud to say, a friend, the real greatness of Ralph Atlass is born in the complete integrity he has for our industry; integrity for the business aspect, for the client and for the public. Long before an NAB existed to establish a code of broadcast standards, Ralph Atlass had limited commercial word count and had introduced a maximum spot content in the broadcast hour, in keeping with good taste he had banned certain types of objectionable advertising. Long before an FCC demanded a share of time devoted to public service, Ralph Atlass had initiated a wide spectrum of programming designed to serve the needs of our society. Long before our present-day rating services were created to benefit the advertiser in measuring circulation and to assist management in pleasing the public,

Ralph Atlass conducted radio's first coincidental listener survey—this is integrity—not imposed by rules or regulations, but born in a mind and a heart.

Today, Ralph Atlass, as vice president of a great group of radio and television stations, continues to contribute, long he will. He will continue to teach us how radio stations should be properly operated to serve the needs of an audience. He will continue to teach us the value of integrity.

This is the Ralph Atlass we honor tonight.

L.B.J. REEMPHASIZES U.S. DESIRE TO NEGOTIATE

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee, in an editorial dated April 30, 1965, makes it abundantly clear to all that our President and our Nation is willing to enter unconditionally into discussions on the Vietnamese crisis.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the full text of this editorial:

L.B.J. REEMPHASIZES U.S. DESIRE TO NEGOTIATE

President Lyndon B. Johnson has provided new evidence America is eager to end hostilities in Vietnam. In a well mounted press conference he emphasized again the willingness of this Nation to enter unconditionally into discussions on the Vietnamese war, or any other subject with any government in order to advance the cause of peace.

He emphasized that this Nation will not relax its support of South Vietnam so long as it is under aggression from the Vietcong.

Many the world over are asking why the United States is in this messy fracas at all. The answer is obvious. It is there because twice it has been drawn into world wars which it did nothing to head off when they were building.

And America well may ask: Why are we in this alone? Do the nations of Europe have no recollections of Munich? Do they have no memory of the clearly hostile steps taken by the general staff of Germany before 1914?

This Nation has the logic of history on its side. A Communist bloc, which already has declared war on all capitalistic powers, is making a preliminary move in this war. America is standing alone in trying to check the expansion of a force which threatens all free governments.

Of course this Nation should have done more than it has done on the diplomatic level. It should have reminded the signatories to the treaty which ended the Indochina war in 1954 that they have as grave a responsibility as the United States has to see the treaty is observed. Probably the United States has done so. But has it done so in terms which the other nations cannot profitably ignore? Certainly the United States should demand a showdown with the treaty signatories, with the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and with the United Nations.

It is a reflection on this country's persuasive power and on the gratitude of the other free nations that America alone has to suffer the full cost of fighting the advance actions of the Red bloc, which if they are successful will embroil the whole world in annihilatory war.